



## Source Attribution and Risk Assessment of Antimicrobial Resistance

Pires, Sara Monteiro; Riberio Duarte, Ana Sofia; Hald, Tine

*Published in:*  
Microbiology Spectrum

*Link to article, DOI:*  
[10.1128/microbiolspec.ARBA-0027-2017](https://doi.org/10.1128/microbiolspec.ARBA-0027-2017)

*Publication date:*  
2018

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Pires, S. M., Riberio Duarte, A. S., & Hald, T. (2018). Source Attribution and Risk Assessment of Antimicrobial Resistance. *Microbiology Spectrum*, 6(3), [ARBA-0027-2017]. <https://doi.org/10.1128/microbiolspec.ARBA-0027-2017>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1    **Source Attribution Models and Risk Assessment**

2    Sara M. Pires, Ana Sofia Duarte and Tine Hald

3

4    **Sara M. Pires\***

5    Risk Benefit Research Group, Division of Diet, Disease Prevention and Toxicology,

6    National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark

7    Kemitorvet, Building 201, Room 116. 2800 Kgs. Lyngby

8    **Phone:** +45 4021 3489

9    **E-mail:** [smpi@food.dtu.dk](mailto:smpi@food.dtu.dk) (SP)

10    **ORCID:** [orcid.org/0000-0002-7751-1509](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7751-1509)

11

12    **Ana Sofia R. Duarte**

13    Unit for Genomic Epidemiology, National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark

14    Kemitorvet, Building 204. 2800 Kgs. Lyngby

15    **Phone:** +45 7170 1798

16    **E-mail:** [asrd@food.dtu.dk](mailto:asrd@food.dtu.dk) (AD)

17    **ORCID:** [orcid.org/0000-0002-8794-0542](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8794-0542)

18

19    **Tine Hald**

Unit for Genomic Epidemiology, National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark

Kemitorvet, Building 204. 2800 Kgs. Lyngby

**Phone:** +45 5115 7485

**E-mail:** [tiha@food.dtu.dk](mailto:tiha@food.dtu.dk) (TH)

**ORCID:** [orcid.org/0000-0002-1115-9792](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1115-9792)

**\*Corresponding Author. Send proofs to:**

Sara M. Pires, [smpi@food.dtu.dk](mailto:smpi@food.dtu.dk)

## Summary

Source attribution and microbial risk assessment methods have been widely applied for the control of several foodborne pathogens worldwide by identifying i) the most important pathogen sources, and ii) the risk represented by specific foods and the critical points in these foods' production chain for microbial control. Such evidence has proved crucial for risk managers to identify and prioritize effective food safety and public health strategies. In the context of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) from livestock and pets, the utility of these methods is recognized but a number of challenges have largely prevented their application and routine use. One key challenge has been to define the hazard in question: is it the antimicrobial drug use in animals, the antimicrobial resistant bacteria in animals and foods, or the antimicrobial resistant genes that can be transferred between commensal and pathogenic bacteria in the animal or human gut or in the environment? Other important limitations include the lack of occurrence and transmission data, and the lack of evidence to inform dose-response relationships. We present the

main principles, available methods, strengths and weaknesses of source attribution and risk assessment methods, discuss their utility to identify sources and estimate risks of AMR from livestock and pets, and provide an overview of conducted studies. In addition, we discuss remaining challenges and current and future opportunities to improve methods and knowledge on the sources and transmission routes of AMR from animals through food, direct contact or the environment, including due to improvements in surveillance and developments on genotypic typing methods.

## **1. Introduction**

Antimicrobial use in humans and animals has been identified as a main driver of AMR, and bacteria harboring resistance to antimicrobials can be found in humans, animals, foods and the environment. As a consequence, humans can be exposed to antimicrobial resistant bacteria through a wide range of sources and transmission pathways. To inform policies aimed at reducing the burden of AMR from animals and foods, risk managers need evidence on the most important sources and transmission routes, and the critical points throughout the production chain for the prevention and control of AMR. While this process is complex and deeply reliant on the integration of surveillance data from humans, animals and foods, it is supported by scientific disciplines that have evolved rapidly in the last decades, including *source attribution* and *quantitative risk assessment*.

Source attribution is a relatively new discipline that has been developed to assist risk managers to identify and prioritize effective food safety intervention measures. It is defined as the *partitioning of the human disease burden of one or more foodborne illnesses to specific sources, where the*

term source includes reservoirs and vehicles (1). A variety of source attribution methods is available to estimate the relative contribution of different reservoirs or vehicles of foodborne pathogens, including methods relying on data on the occurrence of the pathogen in sources and humans, epidemiological studies, intervention studies or expert elicitations. These methods have been applied to inform food safety policy-making at national or international level, particularly to inform *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* intervention strategies (see e.g. (2–6)). Source attribution methods differ in their approaches and data requirements, and as a consequence they attribute disease at different points along the food chain (points of attribution), i.e. at the point of reservoir (e.g. animal production stage, environment emissions) or point of exposure (end of the transmission chain) (Figure 1). The application and utility of each method, therefore, depends on the risk management question being addressed and on the availability of data.

Figure 1. Routes of transmission of zoonotic pathogens and points of source attribution. Adapted from (7).

Microbial risk assessment is a systematic and science-based approach to estimate the risk of microbial hazards in the production-to-consumption chain (8, 9). Microbial risk assessment can be used to detect critical control points along the food chain and for the assessment of control and intervention strategies. It is a well-established discipline that has been widely applied to estimate the risk of an extensive variety of pathogen-food commodity pairs, and it is also systematically applied to inform food safety risk management in many countries and international bodies such as the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (e.g. (10–12)). In coordination with source attribution studies, it is particularly useful to focus on the production chain of the most important source(s) of the hazard of interest (as identified in the source attribution step), identify the steps

in the food chain that are critical for hazard control, and identify and suggest strategies for reduction of the risk to humans.

While source attribution and risk assessment have been widely used to provide evidence that can support strategies to reduce the burden of a number of foodborne pathogens, the transmission and spread of pathogens carrying resistance to antimicrobials adds an extra layer of complexity to this integrated food safety paradigm. On one hand, virtually any foodborne pathogen can acquire resistance to antimicrobials, which may lead to prolonged and more severe disease and even be life-threatening, when antimicrobial therapy is required but fails to succeed due to resistance towards the prescribed drug(s). On the other hand, the potential transfer of antimicrobial resistance genes (i.e. the gene(s) carrying the resistance trait) between pathogenic and commensal bacteria in the human gut can amplify the public health impact of foodborne AMR (13). As a consequence, it is not only challenging to estimate the direct risk posed by resistant foodborne pathogens, but also to quantify the relative contribution to risk of the transfer of AMR genes, e.g. from commensals originating from animal reservoirs to human pathogens.

This chapter describes the overall concepts and methods within source attribution and microbial risk assessment, provides the state-of-the art of their application in the area of AMR, and discusses current challenges and future perspectives for the development of methods to inform policies to reduce the disease burden of AMR in human populations.

## **2. Source attribution**

### 2.1. Source attribution of antimicrobial resistance

The purpose of applying source attribution methods to antimicrobial resistant pathogens (i.e. a pathogen that has acquired resistance to at least one antimicrobial drug) or AMR genes is to

108 identify the most important sources and transmission routes for human exposure to AMR. It is  
109 widely recognized that one of the main drivers of resistance in zoonotic bacteria is antimicrobial  
110 use in livestock production (i.e. in the reservoirs) (14). Identifying the most important reservoirs  
111 for human exposure to AMR is hence critical to direct policy making aimed at reducing  
112 antimicrobial use at the primary production level. In addition, knowledge on the transmission  
113 routes from reservoirs to humans is crucial for the prioritization of risk management along the  
114 food chain.

115 While a range of source attribution methods attributing disease to the original reservoirs or to  
116 exposure routes of foodborne pathogens exists, only a few studies have applied these in the  
117 context of AMR, and the relative importance of transmission pathways of resistance remains a  
118 critical knowledge gap.

119 Challenges of applying source attribution methods for AMR include the fact that virtually any  
120 pathogen can become resistant to antimicrobials and that most zoonotic pathogens can be  
121 transmitted to humans via a variety of foodborne and non-foodborne routes. Thus far, source  
122 attribution typically focused on a single pathogen (e.g. *Salmonella* or *Escherichia coli*), and on  
123 resistance profiles found among that pathogen in different sources (15–17). In addition,  
124 antimicrobial resistance genes are often located on plasmids, which can be transferred between  
125 bacterial species (plasmid-mediated horizontal gene transfer) and therefore also from commensal  
126 bacteria to human pathogens (e.g. *Klebsiella* spp.). Focusing on a single bacterial species is  
127 therefore likely to underestimate the overall exposure and thus the risk posed by AMR.

128 To address this challenge, source attribution of the AMR determinant may be more efficient.  
129 Such studies require knowledge and data on the prevalence, abundance and transmission of  
130 genes, and on horizontal gene transfer rates, which is still being gathered (e.g. in the European

Union project EFFORT - Ecology from Farm to Fork Of microbial drug Resistance and Transmission; <http://www.effort-against-amr.eu/>).

## 2.2. Existing source attribution approaches

### 2.2.1. Microbial subtyping

The microbial subtyping approach involves characterization of the hazard by subtyping methods (e.g., phenotypic or genotypic subtyping of bacterial strains), and the principle is to compare the subtypes of isolates from different sources (e.g. animals, food) with the subtypes isolated from humans. The subtyping approach attributes illness at the point of reservoir and is enabled by the identification of strong associations between some of the dominant subtypes and a specific reservoir or source, providing a heterogeneous distribution of subtypes among the sources (1).

Microbial subtyping methods for source attribution include frequency matched models and population genetic models. While the frequency matched methods are based on the comparison of human strain types and the distribution of those types in the sources, the population genetic models are based on modelling the organism's evolutionary history (18). In the frequency-matched models, subtypes exclusively or almost exclusively isolated from one source are regarded as indicators for the human health impact of that particular source, assuming that all human cases caused by these subtypes originate only from that source. Human cases of disease caused by subtypes found in several reservoirs are then distributed relative to the prevalence of the indicator types (2, 3, 19). Population genetics approaches use genotyping data to infer evolutionary and clonal relationships among different strains, including the occurrence of novel (combinations of) alleles in strains from humans that are unobserved in source populations (20).



All microbial subtyping models require a collection of temporally and spatially related isolates from various sources, and thus are facilitated by an integrated foodborne disease surveillance programme providing a collection of isolates from the major animal reservoirs of foodborne diseases. These models do not require prevalence data, and can rely on the distribution of the isolates' subtypes in the different sources and in humans.

Either type of models has been applied to attribute foodborne pathogens to sources in a variety of countries. Microbial subtyping approaches have been particularly successful to attribute *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* infections (see e.g. (3, 21–24)). The method has also been applied to other pathogens (namely *Listeria monocytogenes* and shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (25, 26)), even though less frequently due to lack of available surveillance data in most countries.

The microbial subtyping approach has seldom been used to estimate the relative contribution of sources of antimicrobial resistant pathogens to AMR in humans. To our knowledge, two frequency-matched studies have been conducted, both using antimicrobial susceptibility patterns as a typing method for *Salmonella* (15, 16). Both studies demonstrate that AMR data can be used to characterize pathogen subtypes in a microbial subtyping source-attribution model, and discuss its utility in terms of discriminatory power, but do not focus on the source origin of specific AMR genes.

Microbial subtyping methods are recognized as one of the most robust data-driven methods for source attribution. They have the advantage of attributing illness to the reservoirs of the pathogens, thus informing risk-management strategies closest possible to the original sources and preventing further spread to other routes or sources of transmission (1). Another advantage of this approach is that it does not require data on the prevalence and concentration of the pathogen in

the different sources (which is often difficult to obtain), or on the exposure frequency in the population. Still, these methods are often limited by the requirement of comparable subtyping data originating from an operative integrated surveillance of human cases and food/animals. In addition, the methods cannot distinguish between different transmission routes from a specific animal reservoir to humans.

### 2.2.2. Comparative exposure assessment

Comparative exposure assessments determine the relative importance of the known transmission routes by estimating the human exposure to the hazard (e.g. pathogen) via each route. For each known transmission route, this approach requires information on the prevalence and/or dose/concentration of the pathogen in the source, of the changes of the prevalence and quantity of the pathogen throughout the transmission chain, and of the frequency at which humans are exposed by that route (e.g. consumption data). Exposure doses are then compared, and the relative contribution of each of the various transmission routes to human exposure in the population is estimated, proportionally to the size of each exposure dose.

The data requirements of the comparative exposure assessment approach will depend on the overall transmission groups considered in the model (i.e. foodborne, environmental and/or contact with animals), as well as on the point in the transmission chain where the “origin” of the pathogen is set. In general, contamination data for each source, information on the main steps in the transmission chain and data on the effects of these on contamination, and exposure data are needed. If transmission via contact with live animals is considered, the exposure model needs to be expanded and consider different possibilities for direct and indirect contact with a contaminated animal.

Exposure assessments have been used with different degrees of success to source attribute disease by several microbial agents, namely *Listeria*, *Campylobacter*, VTEC (and *Toxoplasma gondii*, and by chemical hazards - aflatoxins, cadmium and lead(27–34).

In the context of AMR, this approach is particularly useful to address a widely-recognized knowledge gap, which is understanding the relative contribution of the exposure routes of AMR from animals to humans. Specifically, it can be used to estimate the relative importance of the food chain, companion animals and the environment for exposure of the general population to antimicrobial resistant bacteria or AMR genes. Thus far (and to our knowledge), two comparative exposure assessments have been applied to estimate the relative contribution of different types of meat to the exposure of consumers to extended spectrum beta-lactamases (ESBL)/and AmpC beta-lactamases producing *Escherichia coli* in the Netherlands(17) and in Denmark (35).

An important drawback of this approach is that, due to data limitations and gaps (e.g. in food preparation habits and the effect of these in the contamination of foods), exposure estimates for microbial pathogens are likely to present wide uncertainty intervals. Furthermore, in the context of AMR, these studies focus on specific antimicrobial resistant pathogens, and do not address all concomitant transmission routes contributing to overall transmission of resistance to humans (e.g. same AMR determinant present in other members of the meat bacterial community), which adds to the uncertainty of the relative exposure estimates.

### 2.2.3. Epidemiological approaches

Epidemiological approaches for source attribution include analyses of data from outbreak investigations and studies of sporadic infections; both approaches attribute illness at the point of exposure. An outbreak is here defined as (1) the occurrence of two or more cases of a similar

illness resulting from the exposure to a common source (36), or (2) a situation in which the observed number of cases exceeds the expected number and where the cases are linked to the same food source (37). Sporadic cases represent cases that have not been associated with known outbreaks (38). Even though outbreak-associated cases are more likely to be captured by public health surveillance systems, an unknown proportion of cases classified as sporadic may be part of undetected outbreaks.

Many outbreak investigations are successful in identifying the specific contaminated source or ingredient causing human infections. A simple descriptive analysis or summary of outbreak investigations is useful for quantifying the relative contribution of different foods to outbreak illnesses. However, these implicated foods may be composed of multiple ingredients, and thus outbreak data does not always allow pinpointing the actual source of infection. Probabilistic models using outbreak data to estimate the total number of illnesses in the population attributable to different foods provide a useful way to generalize outbreak data to a broader population of foodborne illnesses. These models are not only used to generalize the results of outbreak investigations, but also to estimate the contaminated sources in composite or “complex” foods.

Analyses of data from outbreak investigations benefit from detailed data on each reported outbreak, and require the adoption of a food categorization scheme for classification of implicated foods (see e.g.(39)). Composite foods will be assigned to two or more food categories depending on the number and nature of their ingredients. By assigning a probability to each ingredient corresponding to the likelihood that it was the source of the outbreak, outbreak data, including data about both simple and complex foods, can be used to attribute foodborne illnesses to sources.

Several analyses of outbreak data for source attribution have been published in recent years, most of them modelling (40–42) or summarizing (43, 44) data from multiple pathogens. The strength of this method is that it uses data that is readily available in many countries worldwide, and thus its use is not restricted to countries with integrated foodborne disease surveillance programmes. Also, it attributes foodborne illnesses at the point of exposure, which means that it is particularly useful to identify which foods (including processed foods) most frequently cause disease, as well as which risk factors contribute more for contamination of foods at the end of the food chain (e.g. cross contamination). This type of information is valuable to define interventions at the processing and consumption level, but does not provide evidence to inform risk management strategies at the origin of the pathogen (reservoirs).

Several outbreaks caused by antimicrobial resistant pathogens have been reported and investigated in the last decades (see e.g. (45, 46)). A review of outbreak data has also been used for source attribution of antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* in the United States, suggesting that antimicrobial susceptibility data on isolates from foodborne outbreaks can help determine which foods are associated with resistant infections (47). Even though few countries or regions are likely to have sufficient data for a robust source attribution analysis using AMR-related outbreaks, summarizing available information may provide evidence on the relative contribution of different foods for infection with antimicrobial resistant pathogens.

Another epidemiological approach that can be used for source attribution of foodborne disease is the case control study of sporadic cases. Case-control studies are a valuable tool to identify potential risk factors for human illness, including sources and predisposing, behavioral or seasonal factors (48). In addition to individual case-control studies, a systematic review of published case-control studies of sporadic infections of a given pathogen can provide an

overview of the relevant exposures and risk factors for that disease, and a summary of the estimated population attributable fractions for each exposure (49). A systematic review follows a rigorous search strategy to identify all potentially relevant peer-review case-control studies for a hazard, studies being conducted in a variety of countries and time periods, designed with different settings, and potentially focused on specific age groups within the population. A meta-analysis is then performed to compare and combine information from different studies. To do this, risk factors may be stratified according to source-categorization schemes, location of exposures and, if appropriate, frequency of exposure. An overall population attributable fraction derived from a meta-analysis or weighted summary of several case-control studies of a certain hazard can be combined with estimates of the burden of disease caused by that hazard to estimate the burden of disease attributed to each exposure.

This method is particularly useful for hazards that do not frequently cause outbreaks but that have been extensively studied (50). In addition, it is valuable to attribute illness at a regional or global level when data are scarce in most countries. A number of case-control studies have been conducted to investigate risk factors for infection with foodborne pathogens resistant to antimicrobials (see e.g. (51, 52)). However, the utility of a meta-analysis of case-control studies to investigate the relative contribution of different sources and risk factors for infection with antimicrobial resistant pathogens may be limited if a low number of case-control studies focused on specific antimicrobial resistant pathogens or AMR genes has been conducted.

#### 2.2.4. Other approaches

Other approaches for source attribution of foodborne pathogens include intervention studies and expert elicitations. Intervention studies are large-scale, well-structured prospective studies that

are specifically tailored to evaluate direct impacts of a specific intervention on the risk of disease in a population. While they would be the gold-standard of an attribution study, they have the disadvantages of being resource-demanding, expensive, and difficult to implement because other concurrent factors may affect occurrence of disease.

Expert elicitations can be designed as structured methods to gather and analyze knowledge from experts, which are communicated with a measure of uncertainty. They are particularly useful to attribute the burden of foodborne diseases to main transmission pathways (i.e. foodborne, environmental, direct contact), for which data-driven methods are typically insufficient(50).

There are numerous methods used for expert elicitation, including methods that are based upon iteration and finding consensus among a small group of experts (e.g. the Delphi method). Expert judgments are subjective by nature and may be biased by the specific background and scientific expertise of the respondents, and several methods to evaluate the expert's performance have been described. Several expert elicitation studies have been conducted for source attribution of foodborne disease (e.g. Havelaar et al. 2008; Ravel et al. 2010). The World Health Organization's Initiative to Estimate the Global Burden of Foodborne Diseases (WHO-FERG) has undertaken a large-scale and successful expert elicitation to attribute disease by 19 foodborne hazards to main transmission groups at a global, regional and sub-regional level (55). The study applied structured expert judgment using Cooke's Classical Model (56) to obtain estimates for the relative contributions of different transmission pathways for several foodborne hazards.

### 2.3. Applications and results

Despite the increased recognition of the importance of source attribution of foodborne pathogens to direct risk management strategies, and the growing use of these approaches in several countries

and research groups, source attribution of AMR is still in its infancy. There are few published examples of the different methods here described, and the identified challenges are still being addressed. The two microbial subtyping studies published are both frequency-matched studies that used antimicrobial susceptibility patterns as a typing method for *Salmonella* (15, 16). These studies use AMR profiles as a typing method (i.e. to characterize pathogen subtypes) but do not focus on the source origin of specific AMR genes. Still, they are able to estimate the distribution of AMR in human cases attributed to different sources, as is done routinely in the *Salmonella* source attribution activities in Denmark (57). Similarly, the two comparative exposure assessments that have been applied to estimate the relative contribution of different types of meat to the exposure of consumers to AMR have focused on the same causative agent, this time extended spectrum beta-lactamases (ESBL)/and AmpC beta-lactamases producing *Escherichia coli* (17, 35). These studies demonstrate that the method could be extended to other countries and agents. The recent review of outbreak data for source attribution of antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* in the United States suggests that antimicrobial susceptibility data on isolates from foodborne outbreaks can help determine which foods are associated with resistant infections (47). This method could be applied in countries that have sufficient data, or to regional data in an attempt to gather information from multiple countries. Numerous epidemiological studies of sporadic infections (case-control or cohort studies) investigating risk factors for of antimicrobial resistant infections in humans demonstrate these methods usefulness to identify routes of AMR (e.g. (58–60)). While their use focusing on foodborne or direct or indirect contact to animals' transmission has been limited, available studies still provide information for food safety risk management (51, 52).



#### 2.4. Strengths and weaknesses

Source attribution of AMR genes and of antimicrobial resistant pathogens is a research area under active development. The application of the methods here described remains a challenge, for reasons that depend on each method considered.

For the application of subtyping frequency-matched studies, two of the main challenges are the limited availability of animal, food and human AMR data from established surveillance systems, and the difficulty to define number of antimicrobial resistance profiles highly specific to a particular source/transmission route, a cornerstone of this method. Furthermore, the fact that the method does not determine the actual transmission route from each specific reservoir to humans represents another limitation for the use of frequency-matched models. Due to the public health need for understanding the transmission of AMR, population genetics approaches may eventually be a good complement to frequency-matched models, especially considering the increasing availability of whole genome sequencing and metagenomics data, which describe occurrence of AMR genes in populations. For instance, population genetics can help identifying reservoir-specific AMR genes' patterns that can then be used in frequency-matched models. New generation sequencing data may also contribute to unravel details that contribute to a more accurate source-attribution, such as the evolution of AMR patterns over time in different sources, and resistance in humans that is not transmitted from animals or foods.

While single genomics and metagenomics may support the development of novel subtyping source-attribution methods, they may hinder the application of comparative exposure assessment. Information on prevalence and quantity of AMR genes or antimicrobial resistant pathogens in each source, as well as their changes throughout the transmission chain, are difficult to assess from those data and impaired by a high degree of uncertainty.

Epidemiological methods of source-attribution, e.g. based on outbreak investigation, have the advantage of not relying on a sophisticated, data abundant and integrated surveillance system, encompassing animal reservoirs, foods and humans. However, they require consistent AMR investigation on food sources and human cases, based at least on bacterial isolation and phenotypic susceptibility testing. Eventually, new generation sequencing may overtake traditional diagnostic methods in outbreak investigation (14, 61), which will also require modification of the current epidemiological approaches.

Intervention studies have, in the context of AMR, the same limitations as when applied to bacterial pathogens. It is difficult to evaluate the exact impact of a specific intervention (e.g. reducing antimicrobial use at the farm level) on the population where disease is attributed (e.g. AMR occurrence in humans). Control measures that reduced antimicrobial use in primary production have been successfully implemented with the aim of reducing AMR in animals (e.g. the antimicrobial growth promoter intervention, the voluntary ban on the use of cephalosporins and the yellow card antimicrobial scheme in swine herds in Denmark (62–64)). However, to assess the real success of such measures in terms of public health impact, it is necessary to collect data prior to and following the intervention (14), at all dimensions of AMR transmission to humans, i.e. also including other transmission routes such as environment and antimicrobial use in humans.

### 3. Risk assessment

#### 3.1. Microbial Risk Assessment (MRA) of antimicrobial resistance

Risk assessment is the process of estimating the likelihood that exposure to a biological, chemical or physical hazard will result in an adverse health effect in exposed individuals. Microbial risk assessment has been established as a part of the food safety risk analysis paradigm by international and national bodies in the last decades, with harmonized guidelines being proposed and widely adopted worldwide (8, 65). In the context of AMR, risk assessments are useful to inform regulatory decision making for the mitigation of potential health consequences in both humans and animals (66). While the importance and need for AMR risk assessments have been recognized for decades (67), its application has been complicated by several knowledge gaps. Challenges of the development of AMR risk assessment include:

- The nature of the hazard is difficult to identify and will determine the nature of the adverse consequence of the exposure. In the context of AMR risk assessment, different hazards can be considered (68, 69). For example, Salisbury et al.(2017) (68)discussed three interrelated hazards that can be assessed separately: the antimicrobial drug, the antimicrobial resistantbacteria, and the AMR determinant, leading to three different health consequences, respectively - development of resistance, infection and treatment failure and transference of resistance. Similarly, Manaia (2017)(69) describes that resistome-associated risks have been discussed considering the microbial community, the genome and transmission of resistance.
- The nature of the risk posed by antimicrobial use and AMR to human health is inherently complex and logically linked to the nature of the hazard, as mentioned above. In other words, while the likelihood that humans will be infected by pathogens that are resistant to

one or several antimicrobials can be estimated, the resulting adverse health consequences can be one or several of the following: development of disease due to infection with the pathogen; failure of treatment of the infection due to resistance to the used drug(s); and spread of AMR genes to commensal bacteria in the human host (which can amplify the risk and extend the impact of an isolated exposure in time).

- There are numerous factors in the process of selection and spread of resistance in bacterial populations, between and within animal species, humans and the environment, and within different bacterial populations in those same reservoirs. These factors include the several drivers for the emergence and spread of AMR in the food production, specifically at the farm. At this level, antimicrobial use is recognized as the most important driver, but not always necessary (if for example co-resistance and co-selection occur), and not always sufficient; additional drivers are e.g. poor prevention and control of infectious diseases leading to increased antimicrobial use and the spread of clones that have established themselves in the herd/environment, and keep selective pressure, even if antimicrobial use is interrupted. These factors, among many others, influence the development of exposure assessment in microbial risk assessment.
- Additionally to the challenges described above, estimating the likelihood of adverse health effects, given exposure to an antimicrobial resistant pathogen or determinant, is difficult due to the absence of a well-defined dose-response effect for AMR, and the existence of various possibilities of adverse effect.

Recognizing the need for AMR risk assessments to identify strategies aimed at preventing and reducing the disease burden of AMR transmitted through foods, a number of reviews and scientific articles have proposed frameworks for such risk assessments in the late 90's and early

2000's (67, 68, 70). Even though such proposals were comprehensive and structured to address the challenges identified at that time, they were not widely adopted, mostly due to remaining knowledge and data gaps in the AMR transmission and impact. More recent frameworks apply current available data and either are mostly qualitative or semi-quantitative (see e.g. (71, 72)), take a linear approach (e.g. (73)), and/or focus on marketing authorization applications for antimicrobial veterinary medicinal products for use in food producing species (74).

### 3.2. Description of the four steps of microbial risk assessment focusing on AMR

The microbial risk assessment process is, as described by the *Codex Alimentarius* guidelines (8), constituted by four main components: hazard identification, hazard characterization, exposure assessment and risk characterization.

In an AMR risk assessment, the hazard can be the antimicrobial drug, the antimicrobial resistant pathogen or the AMR determinant. Ultimately, the *identification of the hazard* of interest will depend of the risk-assessment question to be addressed. In a traditional microbial risk assessment (i.e. focused on a pathogen-food pair, without considering resistance to antimicrobial drugs) the hazard identification step consists of the qualitative description of the hazard, including the evaluation of the presence of the pathogen in a food product available for consumption in a population and the host interface (types of disease caused, susceptible populations). In the context of AMR, this step is complicated by a number of factors: i) selection of resistance in a pathogen can occur by multiple mechanisms (namely mutation and horizontal gene transfer of mobile genetic elements containing AMR genes (HGT)) (75); ii) one or more genes may be necessary for development of AMR; iii) AMR genes can be located in chromosomal or extra-chromosomal

DNA such as plasmids (75), and iv) several bacterial species or strains can harbor and serve as a reservoir for resistance.

The *hazard characterization* step of a risk assessment consists of the review and collection of information on the relationship between the dose of the hazard and the onset of disease in the exposed individuals (i.e. infectious dose), and the relationship between different doses and the probability of occurrence of disease (i.e. dose-response). The response of a human population to exposure to a foodborne pathogen is highly variable, reflecting the fact that the incidence of disease is dependent on a variety of factors such as the virulence characteristics of the pathogen, the numbers of cells ingested, the general health and immune status of the hosts, and the attributes of the food that alter microbial-host interaction (76). Thus, the likelihood that any individual becomes ill due to an exposure to a foodborne pathogen is dependent on the integration of host, pathogen, and food matrix effects. Again, in AMR risk assessment, the required data to assess a dose-response relationship will depend on the hazard considered; it can be one of the three: dose level of the antimicrobial for observing resistance usually expressed by minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) breakpoint (75), or any other factor that can affect the development or amplification of resistance, the dose of the pathogen needed to cause disease, or any factor related to the stability and transfer potential of the AMR gene in a bacterial population (68).

In the *exposure assessment* step, the likelihood that an individual or a population will be exposed to a hazard and the numbers of the microorganism that are likely to be ingested are estimated (77). The exposure assessment requires data on the prevalence and concentration of the hazard in the food source(s), as well as information on the potential changes of the pathogen load throughout the food processing chain (e.g. growth, reduction) (78); in addition, it requires data on

the frequency and amount of food consumed by individuals of the population. As mentioned above, numerous factors influence the process of selection and spread of resistance, consequently influencing the final exposure of the consumer to AMR genes or antimicrobial resistant pathogens. These factors are either still unknown or there are limited data reporting their influence on AMR transmission throughout the food chain.

In the last component of a risk assessment, *risk characterization*, the final risk to the consumer is estimated by integrating the previous three components. Specifically, the measure of exposure (i.e. the likely dose an individual is exposed to in a given food consumption/exposure event) is integrated with the dose-response relationship to estimate the likelihood of adverse health effect. In the context of AMR microbial risk assessment, even after an appropriate definition of the risk question and the targeted hazard identification (which determine the adverse effect to be assessed), and the estimation of the likelihood of exposure to the hazard of interest, characterizing the risk in the absence of an appropriate and comprehensive hazard characterization step remains a challenge. A “dose-response” step becomes particularly demanding when “dose” at exposure is expressed in genotypic terms (by use of genomics or metagenomics AMR data) and “response” must be expressed in phenotypic terms (e.g. expression of resistance in a pathogen or horizontal transfer of an AMR gene between commensal and pathogenic bacteria).

### 3.3. Applications and results

A number of risk assessments focused on specific antimicrobial resistant pathogens-food/animal pairs have been conducted since the publication of the different proposed guidelines. These include qualitative, semi-quantitative and quantitative risk assessments, performed by food

authorities, academia or industry. Here we provide examples of the three-types of risk assessment that have been important to highlight the challenges and limitations they still face, the applications of their results and the need for further studies.

#### *Qualitative risk assessments*

One of the first studies published assessed the health impact of residues of antibacterial and anti-parasitic drugs in foods of animal origin and was published over two decades ago (79). It was a qualitative and comprehensive review that focused on residues of a variety of drugs in multiple foods, and an important step for the recognition of several of the challenges described in this chapter. More drug- and pathogen-focused qualitative assessments have been conducted since then, including in recent years, such as the qualitative risk assessment focused on Methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) conducted by a multi-sectorial and interdisciplinary expert group in Denmark (80). This study is a good example of an applied risk assessment, conducted upon request from the food and veterinary authorities with the aims of 1) assessing the risk of livestock MRSA based on the existing knowledge and the results of veterinary screening studies conducted in herds, and 2) providing recommendation for control measures to reduce the spread of MRSA from the affected herds to the surrounding environment and community. The method consisted of a comprehensive evaluation of all available data on the prevalence of MRSA in animals and humans, as well as on the risk factors for infection by livestock MRSA from the environment, from meat, from occupational activities (e.g. risk for slaughterhouse or farm workers) and from the community. The risk assessment consisted of a descriptive evaluation of the risk of these types of transmission in the Danish population.

Another recent study has applied the risk assessment framework developed by the European Medicines Agency (74) to assess the AMR risk to public health due to use of antimicrobials in



pigs, using pleuromutilins as an example (81). Livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* of clonal complex 398 (MRSA CC398) and enterococci were identified as relevant hazards. This framework followed the International Organization for Animal Health's (OIE) approach to risk assessment and consisted of four steps describing the risk pathway, combined into a risk estimate. The study applied a qualitative approach, where the output of each step was defined in a scale. Likewise, the level of uncertainty was described qualitatively in the different steps and the output (as high, medium or low). The authors discuss the value of mathematical modeling as a tool to simulate pathways and identifying ways of reducing resistance. Still, they stress that the relationship between reducing consumption of antibiotics and reducing resistance is not necessarily linear, and defend that this relationship needs to be better established for modeling to have full value (81). Despite the fact that this study is recent at the point of writing of this chapter and thus could build on all newly available evidence on AMR mechanisms, it still dealt with substantial data and knowledge gaps that enhanced uncertainty around outputs (81).

Another example of a qualitative assessment is the WHO's list of Critically Important Antimicrobials (71). The list applies criteria to rank antimicrobials according to their relative importance in human medicine. The purpose of this assessment is to provide clinicians, regulatory agencies, policy-makers and other stakeholders' information to develop risk management strategies for the use of antimicrobials in food production animals globally. The first WHO list of Critically Important Antimicrobials was developed in a WHO expert meeting in 2005, where participants considered the list of all antimicrobial classes used in human medicine and categorized antimicrobials into three groups of *critically important*, *highly important*, and *important* based on two criteria that describe first the availability or not of alternatives to the

antimicrobial for treatment of serious bacterial infections in people, and second if the antimicrobial is used to treat infections by (1) bacteria that may be transmitted to humans from nonhuman sources, or (2) bacteria that may acquire resistance genes from nonhuman sources. The output of the qualitative assessment is a list of classes of drugs that met all three of a set of defined priorities. Since its original publication, the assessment has been revised several times and is now in its 5th edition.

#### *Semi-quantitative risk assessments*

One example of a semi-quantitative assessment is the study integrating a probabilistic quantitative risk assessment conducted in Denmark to assess the human health risk of macrolide-resistant *Campylobacter* infection associated with the use of macrolides in Danish pig production (82). This model was able to account for exposure through imported and domestic meat (i.e. that could be a vehicle for antimicrobial resistant bacteria as a consequence of antimicrobial drug use in animal production in the country) and used evidence available at the time. One important feature of this study is that, while it measured exposure probabilistically and thus reflected model and data uncertainty, the final step of the risk assessment –risk characterization – used an ordinal scale and thus risk was described in a qualitative scale.

#### *Quantitative risk assessments*

Several quantitative risk assessments have been published since the early 2000's. These include the high profile assessment of fluoroquinolone-resistant *Campylobacter* from chicken in the United States (US) (83), which ultimately prompted the Food and Drug Administration to propose withdrawal of the approval of the new animal drug applications for fluoroquinolone use

in poultry, an action that would prohibit fluoroquinolone use in chickens and turkeys in the country (84).

Another early study employed probabilistic methodology to analyze the potential public health risk from *Campylobacter jejuni* and fluoroquinolone-resistant *C. jejuni* due to fresh beef and ground beef consumption (85). The model focused on the beef product at retail and modelled consumer handling in the kitchen, processing and consumption. The model estimated first the risk of *Campylobacter* infection through consumption of beef, and then the risk of treatment failure given infection, concluding an increased health impact due to resistance.

In another study, a risk assessment followed the US Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine Guidance (86) and was commissioned by a pharmaceutical company to estimate the risk of human infection treatment failure associated with the use of an AM drug in food animals (87). The deterministic model included all uses of two macrolides in poultry, swine, and beef cattle. The hazard was defined as illness (i) caused by foodborne bacteria with a resistance determinant, (ii) attributed to a specified animal-derived meat commodity, and (iii) treated with a human use drug of the same class. Risk was defined as the probability of this hazard combined with the consequence of treatment failure due to resistant *Campylobacter spp.* or *Enterococcus faecium*. At the time, this microbial risk assessment had the advantage of being quantitative and thus more transparent when compared to previous assessments focusing on AMR. Thus, the authors highlighted several limitations, particularly with regards to data gaps on the probability of treatment failure due to the antimicrobial resistant bacteria and the probability of resistant determinant development. In contrast to many evidence and risk assessments conducted elsewhere, the results of this study lead the authors to conclude that current use of

macrolides in cattle, poultry, and swine create a risk much lower than the potential benefit to food safety, animal welfare, and public health (87).

The same author published another risk assessment a few years later, applying a similar approach to estimate the risk of a different combination of antimicrobial-pathogen - fluoroquinolone-resistant *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in beef in the US (88). This approach was able to provide a better measure of uncertainty but was similar in its findings, concluding that the risk of health consequences in humans was minimal.

The most recent quantitative risk assessment study published is also the more novel and promising of the AMR studies here reviewed (89). It considered the existence of environmental compartments resulting from sewage-treatment plants, agriculture production and manufacturing industries, and assessed their role in the maintenance, emergence and possible dissemination of antibiotic resistance. This study used probabilistic methods to assess the risks of antibiotic resistance development and neutralizing antibiotic pressures in hotspot environments.

Importantly, this study presents a modelling approach to assess the selective pressure exerted by antibiotics in bacterial communities and to calculate antibiotic resistance development risks.

While the described approach was exemplarily used to model antibiotic resistance risks in an intensive aquaculture production scenario of south-east Asia, it has potential to be applied to other cases, including other types of animal production, settings and drugs.

### 3.4. Strength and weaknesses

Microbial risk assessment is a science-based tool with proven benefits in supporting food safety authorities in policy making. It is hence aspired to continue its use in assessing the consequences for the consumer of the transmission of AMR genes /pathogens throughout the food chain. The

fact that it is a well-defined, stepwise-structured method facilitates its adaptation to the food safety challenge of AMR. However, several limitations have already been identified and require the joint focus of the scientific community, risk assessors and authorities. Examples of a few critical challenges are:

- The definition of antimicrobial resistance is critical for the four steps of microbial risk assessment, and needs therefore to be well-established at the very start of a risk assessment study. Martínez et al. (2014) (75) explains the existence of several possible definitions of resistance, (namely clinical, epidemiological and operational), and two definitions of resistance gene (ecological and operational). The adoption of standard concepts and terminology is a requisite for the transparency of microbial risk assessment and an important part of its development. Although transmission of AMR genes and antimicrobial resistant bacteria may be perceived and have been defined as two separate hazards, it has also been recently suggested that the risk of AMR transmission to humans cannot be estimated unless the AMR gene pool and the presence and quantity of antimicrobial resistant bacteria that are able to colonize and multiply in the human body are both taken into consideration (69).
- Exposure assessment often relies on available knowledge of the changes in the microbial hazard levels throughout the food chain, due to e.g. growth or inactivation. In the context of microbiomes and resistomes, it is difficult to model these changes, as the very composition of the microbial population (and corresponding AMR genes) may significantly change between “farm” and “fork” (90, 91). Consequently, microbial risk assessment for AMR is highly dependent on data collected at several points of the transmission pathway, both from the source(s) of AMR and from exposed human subjects.

- While new generation sequencing attractively provides a broad characterization of the presence and abundance of AMR genes in a particular pathogen or in the microbiome from a particular reservoir, it remains a challenge to determine variability of the resistome and of the potential to exchange AMR genes (i.e. presence of phage recombination sites, plasmids, integrons or transposons) between different pathogen strains (69). This knowledge is crucial, respectively, to assign the AMR genes detected with metagenomics to the corresponding bacterial hosts, and to account for the occurrence of horizontal gene transfer between commensal and pathogenic bacteria in a population.
- Furthermore, an important challenge for the integration of metagenomics data in MRA is the harmonization of languages between the “omics” and the food microbiology communities (92).
- Risk characterization requires knowledge of the relationship between a “dose”, resulting from exposure assessment, and a “response”, i.e. the adverse health effect of exposure. However, the infective dose and the modes of transmission of most of the antimicrobial resistant bacteria of relevance are still unknown (69), which represents an important knowledge gap for the development of microbial risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance.
- Finally, a major limitation of the current microbial risk assessment frameworks is that they do not allow estimating the long-term impact of exposure to AMR. Particularly serious public health consequences of AMR arise when multiresistant bacteria emerge and become widely spread. There is therefore the need to develop microbial risk assessment methods that include a different characterization of the risk of AMR. In addition to immediate consequences to human health due to a single exposure to a antimicrobial resistant pathogen, it is necessary to estimate the likelihood that such exposure (eventually together with past and subsequent

ones, to the same or other types of AMR) will lead to the development of antimicrobial multi-resistance in the future. Also, it is necessary to assess the potential of multi-resistance spread, to characterize the severity of the consequences of exposure to multi-resistance and to estimate the time from initial exposure to those consequences.

#### 4. Discussion and future perspectives

Several position and stakeholder papers have stressed the need for improved quality and increased amount of data for risk assessment of AMR (see. e.g.(93)). These include e.g. data on antimicrobial use in animal production, AMR surveillance data in animals, foods and humans, and gene transfer and spread of AMR genes. All data requirements apply for most source attribution studies, and thus are transversal to the methods described in this chapter. Likewise, many of the challenges to the application of these methods in the context of AMR are common to source attribution and risk assessment approaches (Table 1).

Table 1. Definition, overview of methods and main challenges of source attribution and microbial risk assessment approaches.

	Source attribution	Microbial risk assessment
<b>Definition</b>	Partitioning of human cases of illness to the responsible sources (e.g. foods, animal reservoirs)	Systematic and science-based approach to estimate the risk of microbial hazards in the production-to-consumption chain
<b>Methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Microbial subtyping</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative RA*</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative exposure assessment</li> <li>• Outbreak-data analysis</li> <li>• Case-control studies</li> <li>• Expert elicitations</li> <li>• Intervention studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-quantitative RA</li> <li>• Quantitative RA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Deterministic</li> <li>○ Probabilistic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Main challenges in the context of AMR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard identification, e.g. the antimicrobial drug, the antimicrobial resistant pathogen or the AMR determinant</li> <li>• Lack of occurrence/prevalence data</li> <li>• Definition of the health outcome, i.e. infection with antimicrobial resistant agent, treatment failure (in case treatment is needed) or spread of resistance determinant between commensal and pathogenic organisms</li> <li>• Lack of epidemiological data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of dose-response relationship</li> <li>• Determining variability of the resistome and of the potential to exchange AMR genes between different pathogen strains</li> </ul>

656 \*RA: risk assessment

657



658 The studies here described all show the importance of knowledge on 1) the most important  
659 sources and routes of transmission of antimicrobial resistant bacteria or AMR genes, 2) the  
660 actual risk for human health, and 3) the points in the transmission chain where interventions  
661 could be effective to reduce this risk. While all findings so far have been crucial to direct policies  
662 and raise awareness to the public health impact of AMR in animals and foods, they are  
663 insufficient for a complete understanding of the underlying transmission mechanisms and the real  
664 impact of AMR. Several challenges have been addressed, including the fact that emergence and  
665 spread of AMR is complex. From an epidemiological point of view, the risk of AMR most  
666 probably follows the “sufficient-component causes” principle (94) . The sufficient-component  
667 causes is an epidemiological causal modeling approach that can be used to explain diseases, or  
668 conditions like AMR, characterized by many causes, none of which alone is necessary or  
669 sufficient. The relations among the causes are described in a way that a *sufficient cause* is a set of  
670 minimal conditions that will definitely lead to the outcome (e.g. antimicrobial resistant infection),  
671 and a *component cause* is one of the minimal conditions included in a sufficient cause (94). For  
672 example, a particular resistance gene can be a component cause of an antimicrobial resistant  
673 infection, but the sufficient cause of the latter includes other conditions, such as the bacterial  
674 strain carrying that particular gene, that pathogen causing infection, treatment of the infection  
675 with antimicrobial(s) for which resistance is encoded in the gene, and actual expression of that  
676 resistance gene. The future of microbial risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance may  
677 therefore include defining the components sufficient to cause AMR transmission from  
678 animals/foods/environment to humans followed by treatment failure of infections by  
679 antimicrobial resistant pathogens.

Recent developments in “omics” technologies (whole genome sequencing and metagenomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, fluxomics) provide unique opportunities to fill in some of our knowledge gaps. It is now widely recognized that these “omics” technologies have advantages compared to traditional phenotypic culture-based methods for characterizing microorganisms (92, 95).

Brul et al (2012)(92) described in detail how “omics” can be integrated in each step of microbial risk assessment, contributing to a mechanistic insight into the interaction between microorganisms and their hosts, new perspectives on strain diversity and variability and physiological uncertainty, and overall more robust risk assessments. Den Besten et al. (2017)(95) discussed the utility of “omics” technologies applied by the food industry, to help identify the influence of different bacterial ecosystems on both pathogen survival and growth – information that can eventually contribute to the future definition of Food Safety Objectives (FSO).

A particular advantage of metagenomics is that it provides a picture of the whole microbial community and its resistome, which is key to understanding AMR emergence and spread in a population. Importantly, these new “typing” techniques have been rapidly followed by new bioinformatics and new statistics/modelling tools that allow for the analysis and sense-making of such (big) data (92, 96). For example, machine learning has the potential to be applied on the analysis of omics data. Combining machine learning approaches with metagenomics and farm specific data could allow for describing e.g. health, production efficiency, and the relative abundance of AMR genes, based on the identification of (clusters of) genetic factors in the farm microbiome. In addition, such techniques could be used to examine the predictive importance of (clusters of) genetic factors in order to characterize 1) a ‘healthy farm microbiome’ or 2) AMR genes in a specific animal reservoir. They can also be used to identify (combinations of) specific

husbandry practices that are associated with e.g. a particular resistome or a ‘healthy farm microbiome’. The latter could lead to recommendations on how to shift the farm microbiome in order to improve the overall health of the farm, and consequently on the long term, to reduce the level of antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistant bacteria. It is possible that promoting a ‘healthy farm microbiome’ will have a more long-term impact on the overall reduction of AMR, than focusing exclusively on the farm resistome. Metagenomics and other “omics” technologies have hence enormous potential for the future development of source attribution and microbial risk assessment of AMR through foods. To explore their full potential, different technologies shall be combined. For example, genomics studies should be coupled with proteomics, as gene-expression studies do not always reflect the actual protein levels (92). Also, genomic similarities may not imply similarities in behavior, as the surrounding environment (food matrix, bacterial ecosystem, etc) also plays a role (95) . Furthermore, “omics” data are not sufficient without accompanying epidemiological data that allow for the identification of risk factors for AMR.

## **5. Concluding remarks**

Recent developments in source-attribution and microbial risk assessment of AMR are promising and have significantly contributed to the evolution of each of these methods. However, the adaptation to the “omics” big data era is happening at a much slower pace than the speed at which these data are becoming available. This is due to the many challenges encountered when interpreting those data.

Antimicrobial resistance at the animal reservoir, food, environment and human levels is increasingly described by the characterization of the resistomes of single bacteria isolates (by whole genome sequencing) or the bacterial whole community (by metagenomics) representing each of those populations. Gradually, AMR surveillance will convert from phenotypic to

genotypic (e.g. PulseNet International is already on its way to standardize whole genome sequencing-based subtyping of foodborne disease (96). For a successful transition, it is crucial to pair genomic data with phenotypic data and relevant explanatory epidemiological data. This transition will require a parallel adaptation of the existing analysis methods, which will include the development of new source-attribution and microbial risk assessment modelling approaches. It is therefore with great expectation that we foresee in the near future a surge of influencing and inspiring scientific output in both fields.

## 6. References

1. Pires SM, Evers EG, Van Pelt W, Ayers T, Scallan E, Angulo FJ, Havelaar A, Hald T, Schroeter A, Brisabois A, Thebault A, Käsbohrer A, Schroeder C, Frank C, Guo C, Wong DLF, Döpfer D, Snary E, Nichols G, Spitznagel H, Wahlström H, David J, Pancer K, Stark K, Forshell LP, Nally P, Sanders P, Hiller P. 2009. Attributing the human disease burden of foodborne infections to specific sources. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 6.
2. Mullner P, Jones G, Noble A, Spencer SEF, Hathaway S, French NP. 2009. Source attribution of food-borne zoonoses in New Zealand: A modified hald model. *Risk Anal* 29:970–984.
3. Hald T, Vose D, Wegener HC, Koupeev T. 2004. A Bayesian Approach to Quantify the Contribution of Animal-Food Sources to Human Salmonellosis. *Risk Anal* 24:255–269.
4. De Knecht LV, Pires SM, Hald T. 2015. Using surveillance and monitoring data of different origins in a Salmonella source attribution model: A European Union example with challenges and proposed solutions. *Epidemiol Infect* 143.
5. Pires SM, Vigre H, Makela P, Hald T. 2010. Using outbreak data for source attribution of human salmonellosis and campylobacteriosis in Europe. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 7.

- 748 6. Guo C, Hoekstra RM, Schroeder CM, Pires SM, Ong KL, Hartnett E, Naugle A, Harman J, Bennett P,  
749 Cieslak P, Scallan E, Rose B, Holt KG, Kissler B, Mbandi E, Roodsari R, Angulo FJ, Cole D. 2011.  
750 Application of Bayesian techniques to model the burden of human salmonellosis attributable to  
751 U.S. food commodities at the point of processing: Adaptation of a Danish model. Foodborne  
752 Pathog Dis 8.
- 753 7. Pires SM, Evers EG, van Pelt W, Ayers T, Scallan E, Angulo FJ, Havelaar A, Hald T. 2009. Attributing  
754 the human disease burden of foodborne infections to specific sources. Foodborne Pathog Dis  
755 6:417–424.
- 756 8. FAO. 1999. Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Assessment.
- 757 9. OIE. 2002. International Animal Health Code. Off Int des Epizoot Paris 23–30.
- 758 10. USDA. 2012. MICROBIAL RISK ASSESSMENT GUIDELINE PATHOGENIC MICROORGANISMS WITH  
759 FOCUS ON FOOD AND WATER Prepared by the Interagency Microbiological Risk Assessment  
760 Guideline Workgroup Microbial Risk Assessment Guideline.
- 761 11. Wegener HC. 2010. Danish initiatives to improve the safety of meat products. Meat Sci 84:276–  
762 283.
- 763 12. Snary EL, Swart AN, Hald T. 2016. Quantitative Microbiological Risk Assessment and Source  
764 Attribution for *Salmonella* : Taking it Further. Risk Anal 36:433–436.
- 765 13. Lester CH, Frimodt-Moller N, Sorensen TL, Monnet DL, Hammerum AM. 2006. In Vivo Transfer of  
766 the vanA Resistance Gene from an Enterococcus faecium Isolate of Animal Origin to an E. faecium  
767 Isolate of Human Origin in the Intestines of Human Volunteers. Antimicrob Agents Chemother  
768 50:596–599.
- 769 14. Aarestrup FM. 2015. The livestock reservoir for antimicrobial resistance: a personal view on

770 changing patterns of risks, effects of interventions and the way forward. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B*  
771 *Biol Sci* 370:20140085.

772 15. Hald T, Lo Fo Wong DM a, Aarestrup FM. 2007. The attribution of human infections with  
773 antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* bacteria in Denmark to sources of animal origin. *Foodborne*  
774 *Pathog Dis* 4:313–326.

775 16. Vieira AR, Grass J, Fedorka-Cray PJ, Plumblee JR, Tate H, Cole DJ. 2016. Attribution of *Salmonella*  
776 enterica serotype Hadar infections using antimicrobial resistance data from two points in the food  
777 supply system. *Epidemiol Infect* 144:1983–1990.

778 17. Evers EG, Pielaat A, Smid JH, van Duijkeren E, Vennemann FBC, Wijnands LM, Chardon JE. 2017.  
779 Comparative Exposure Assessment of ESBL-Producing *Escherichia coli* through Meat  
780 Consumption. *PLoS One* 12:e0169589.

781 18. Barco L, Barrucci F, Olsen JE, Ricci A. 2013. *Salmonella* source attribution based on microbial  
782 subtyping. *Int J Food Microbiol* 163:193–203.

783 19. Mughini-Gras L, Barrucci F, Smid JH, Graziani C, Luzzi I, Ricci A, Barco L, Rosmini R, Havelaar AH,  
784 VAN Pelt W, Busani L. 2014. Attribution of human *Salmonella* infections to animal and food  
785 sources in Italy (2002–2010): adaptations of the Dutch and modified Hald source attribution  
786 models. *Epidemiol Infect* 142:1070–82.

787 20. Wilson DJ, Gabriel E, Leatherbarrow AJH, Cheesbrough J, Gee S, Bolton E, Fox A, Fearnhead P,  
788 Hart CA, Diggle PJ. 2008. Tracing the source of campylobacteriosis. *PLoS Genet* 4.

789 21. Pires SM, Vieira AR, Hald T, Cole D. 2014. Source Attribution of Human Salmonellosis: An  
790 Overview of Methods and Estimates. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 0:1–10.

791 22. de Knecht LV, Pires SM, Löfström C, Sørensen G, Pedersen K, Torpdahl M, Nielsen EM, Hald T.

- 792 2016. Application of Molecular Typing Results in Source Attribution Models: The Case of Multiple  
793 Locus Variable Number Tandem Repeat Analysis (MLVA) of Salmonella Isolates Obtained from  
794 Integrated Surveillance in Denmark. Risk Anal 36.
- 795 23. Boysen L, Rosenquist H, Larsson JT, Nielsen EM, Sørensen G, Nordentoft S, Hald T. 2013. Source  
796 attribution of human campylobacteriosis in Denmark. Epidemiol Infect 1–10.
- 797 24. Mullner P, Spencer SEF, Wilson DJ, Jones G, Noble AD, Midwinter AC, Collins-Emerson JM, Carter  
798 P, Hathaway S, French NP. 2009. Assigning the source of human campylobacteriosis in New  
799 Zealand: A comparative genetic and epidemiological approach. Infect Genet Evol 9:1311–1319.
- 800 25. Little CL, Pires SM, Gillespie IA, Grant K, Nichols GL. 2010. Attribution of human Listeria  
801 monocytogenes infections in England and Wales to ready-to-eat food sources placed on the  
802 market: adaptation of the Hald Salmonella source attribution model. Foodborne Pathog Dis  
803 7:749–756.
- 804 26. Mughini-Gras L, van Pelt W, van der Voort M, Heck M, Friesema I, Franz E. 2017. Attribution of  
805 human infections with Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) to livestock sources and  
806 identification of source-specific risk factors, The Netherlands (2010-2014). Zoonoses Public  
807 Health.
- 808 27. Evers EG, Fels-Klerx HJ Van Der, Nauta MJ, Schijven JF, Havelaar AH. 2008. Campylobacter source  
809 attribution by exposure assessment. Int J Risk Assess Manag.
- 810 28. Kosmider RD, Nally P, Simons RRL, Brouwer A, Cheung S, Snary EL, Wooldridge M. 2010.  
811 Attribution of human VTEC O157 infection from meat products: A quantitative risk assessment  
812 approach. Risk Anal 30:753–765.
- 813 29. Opsteegh M, Prickaerts S, Frankena K, Evers EG. 2011. A quantitative microbial risk assessment

814 for meatborne *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in The Netherlands. *Int J Food Microbiol* 150:103–  
815 114.

816 30. FDA. 2003. Quantitative Assessment of Relative Risk to Public Health From Foodborne *Listeria*  
817 *monocytogenes* Among Selected Categories of Ready-to-Eat Foods SUMMARY OF PUBLIC  
818 COMMENTS AND FDA/FSIS REVISIONS TO RISK ASSESSMENT.

819 31. EFSA. 2009. SCIENTIFIC OPINION Cadmium in food Scientific Opinion of the Panel on  
820 Contaminants in the Food Chain. *EFSA J* 980:1–139.

821 32. EFSA. 2010. Scientific Opinion on Lead in Food. *EFSA J* 8:1570.

822 33. Cassini A, Hathaway S, Havelaar A, Koopmans M, Koutsoumanis K, Messens W, Müller-Seitz G,  
823 Nørrung B, Rizzi V, Scheutz F. 2016. Microbiological risk assessment. *EFSA J* 14:1–10.

824 34. EFSA. 2007. Opinion of the scientific panel on contaminants in the food chain [CONTAM] related  
825 to the potential increase of consumer health risk by a possible increase of the existing maximum  
826 levels for aflatoxins in almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios and derived prod. *EFSA J* 5:446.

827 35. Carmo LP, Nielsen LR, da Costa PM, Alban L. 2014. Exposure assessment of extended-spectrum  
828 beta-lactamases/AmpC beta-lactamases-producing *Escherichia coli* in meat in Denmark. *Infect*  
829 *Ecol Epidemiol* 4:1–10.

830 36. Olsen SJ, MacKinnon LC, Goulding JS, Bean NH, Slutsker L. 2000. Surveillance for foodborne-  
831 disease outbreaks--United States, 1993-1997. *MMWR CDC Surveill Summ Morb Mortal Wkly*  
832 *report CDC Surveill Summ* 49:1–62.

833 37. Anonymous. EUR-Lex - 32003L0099 - EN. Off J L 325 , 12/12/2003 P 0031 - 0040; OPOCE.

834 38. Neimann J, Engberg J, Mølbak K, Wegener HC. 2003. A case-control study of risk factors for  
835 sporadic campylobacter infections in Denmark. *Epidemiol Infect* 130:353–66.



- 836 39. Painter J a, Ayers T, Woodruff R, Blanton E, Perez N, Hoekstra RM, Griffin PM, Braden C. 2009.  
837 Recipes for foodborne outbreaks: a scheme for categorizing and grouping implicated foods.  
838 Foodborne Pathog Dis 6:1259–1264.
- 839 40. Pires SM, Vigre H, Makela P, Hald T. 2010. Using outbreak data for source attribution of human  
840 salmonellosis and campylobacteriosis in Europe. Foodborne Pathog Dis 7:1351–1361.
- 841 41. Painter JA, Hoekstra RM, Ayers T, Tauxe R V., Braden CR, Angulo FJ, Griffin PM. 2013. Attribution  
842 of foodborne illnesses, hospitalizations, and deaths to food commodities by using outbreak data,  
843 United States, 1998-2008. Emerg Infect Dis 19:407–415.
- 844 42. Pires SM, Vieira AR, Perez E, Wong DLF, Hald T. 2012. Attributing human foodborne illness to food  
845 sources and water in Latin America and the Caribbean using data from outbreak investigations.  
846 Int J Food Microbiol 152:129–138.
- 847 43. Ravel a, Greig J, Tinga C, Todd E, Campbell G, Cassidy M, Marshall B, Pollari F. 2009. Exploring  
848 historical Canadian foodborne outbreak data sets for human illness attribution. J Food Prot  
849 72:1963–76.
- 850 44. King N, Lake R, Campbell D. 2011. Source attribution of nontyphoid salmonellosis in new zealand  
851 using outbreak surveillance data. J Food Prot 74:438–45.
- 852 45. Jones TF, Kellum ME, Porter SS, Bell M, Schaffner W. 2002. An outbreak of community-acquired  
853 foodborne illness caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Emerg Infect Dis 8:82–  
854 84.
- 855 46. Mølbak K, Baggesen DL, Aarestrup FM, Ebbesen JM, Engberg J, Frydendahl K, Gerner-Smidt P,  
856 Petersen AM, Wegener HC. 1999. An Outbreak of Multidrug-Resistant, Quinolone-Resistant  
857 *Salmonella enterica* Serotype Typhimurium DT104. N Engl J Med 341:1420–1425.

- 858 47. BROWN AC, GRASS JE, RICHARDSON LC, NISLER AL, BICKNESE AS, GOULD LH. 2017. Antimicrobial  
859 resistance in *Salmonella* that caused foodborne disease outbreaks: United States, 2003–2012.  
860 *Epidemiol Infect* 145:766–774.
- 861 48. Engberg J. 2006. Contributions to the epidemiology of *Campylobacter* infections. A review of  
862 clinical and microbiological studies. *Dan Med Bull* 53:361–89.
- 863 49. Domingues a. R, Pires SM, Halasa T, Hald T. 2012. Source attribution of human  
864 campylobacteriosis using a meta-analysis of case-control studies of sporadic infections. *Epidemiol*  
865 *Infect* 140:970–981.
- 866 50. Pires SM. 2013. Assessing the applicability of currently available methods for attributing  
867 foodborne disease to sources, including food and food commodities. *Foodborne Pathog Dis*  
868 10:206–13.
- 869 51. Varma JK, Marcus R, Stenzel SA, Hanna SS, Gettner S, Anderson BJ, Hayes T, Shiferaw B, Crume TL,  
870 Joyce K, Fullerton KE, Voetsch AC, Angulo FJ. 2006. Highly Resistant *Salmonella* Newport-  
871 MDRampC Transmitted through the Domestic US Food Supply: A FoodNet Case-Control Study of  
872 Sporadic *Salmonella* Newport Infections, 2002–2003. *J Infect Dis* 194:222–230.
- 873 52. Kassenborg HD, Smith KE, Vugia DJ, Rabatsky-Ehr T, Bates MR, Carter MA, Dumas NB, Cassidy MP,  
874 Marano N, Tauxe RV, Angulo FJ. 2004. Fluoroquinolone-Resistant *Campylobacter* Infections:  
875 Eating Poultry Outside of the Home and Foreign Travel Are Risk Factors. *Clin Infect Dis* 38:S279–  
876 S284.
- 877 53. Havelaar AH, Galindo AV, Kurowicka D, Cooke RM. 2008. Attribution of foodborne pathogens  
878 using structured expert elicitation. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 5:649–659.
- 879 54. Ravel A, Davidson VJ, Ruzante JM, Fazil A. 2010. Foodborne proportion of gastrointestinal illness:

estimates from a Canadian expert elicitation survey. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 7:1463–1472.

55. Hald T, Aspinall W, Devleesschauwer B, Cooke R, Corrigan T, Havelaar AH, Gibb HJ, Torgerson PR, Kirk MD, Angulo FJ, Lake RJ, Speybroeck N, Hoffmann S. 2016. World Health Organization estimates of the relative contributions of food to the burden of disease due to selected foodborne hazards: A structured expert elicitation. *PLoS One* 11:1–35.

56. Cooke R. 1991. *Experts in uncertainty : opinion and subjective probability in science*. Oxford University Press.

57. Anonymous. 2017. *Annual Report on Zoonoses in Denmark 2016*. Natl Food Institute, Tech Univ Denmark.

58. Kim H, Kim YA, Park YS, Choi MH, Lee GI, Lee K. 2017. Risk Factors and Molecular Features of Sequence Type (ST) 131 Extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -Lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* in Community-onset Bacteremia. *Sci Rep* 7:14640.

59. Vos T, Barber RM, Bell B, Bertozzi-Villa A, Biryukov S, Bolliger I, Charlson F, Davis A, Degenhardt L, Dicker D, Duan L, Erskine H, Feigin VL, Ferrari AJ, Fitzmaurice C, Fleming T, Graetz N, Guinovart C, Haagsma J, Hansen GM, Hanson SW, Heuton KR, Higashi H, Kassebaum N, Kyu H, Laurie E, Liang X, Lofgren K, Lozano R, MacIntyre MF, Moradi-Lakeh M, Naghavi M, Nguyen G, Odell S, Ortblad K, Roberts DA, Roth GA, Sandar L, Serina PT, Stanaway JD, Steiner C, Thomas B, Vollset SE, Whiteford H, Wolock TM, Ye P, Zhou M, ??vila MA, Aasvang GM, Abbafati C, Ozgoren AA, Abd-Allah F, Aziz MIA, Abera SF, Aboyans V, Abraham JP, Abraham B, Abubakar I, Abu-Raddad LJ, Abu-Rmeileh NME, Aburto TC, Achoki T, Ackerman IN, Adelekan A, Ademi Z, Adou AK, Adsuar JC, Arnlov J, Agardh EE, Al Khabouri MJ, Alam SS, Alasfoor D, Albittar MI, Alegretti MA, Aleman A V., Alemu ZA, Alfonso-Cristancho R, Alhabib S, Ali R, Alla F, Allebeck P, Allen PJ, AlMazroa MA, Alsharif U, Alvarez E, Alvis-Guzman N, Ameli O, Amini H, Ammar W, Anderson BO, Anderson HR,

903 Antonio CAT, Anwari P, Apfel H, Arsenijevic VSA, Artaman A, Asghar RJ, Assadi R, Atkins LS,  
 904 Atkinson C, Badawi A, Bahit MC, Bakfalouni T, Balakrishnan K, Balalla S, Banerjee A, Barker-Collo  
 905 SL, Barquera S, Barregard L, Barrero LH, Basu S, Basu A, Baxter A, Beardsley J, Bedi N, Beghi E,  
 906 Bekele T, Bell ML, Benjet C, Bennett DA, Bensenor IM, Benzian H, Bernabe E, Beyene TJ, Bhala N,  
 907 Bhalla A, Bhutta Z, Bienhoff K, Bikbov B, Abdulhak A Bin, Blore JD, Blyth FM, Bohensky MA, Basara  
 908 BB, Borges G, Bornstein NM, Bose D, Boufous S, Bourne RR, Boyers LN, Brainin M, Brauer M,  
 909 Brayne CEG, Brazinova A, Breitborde NJK, Brenner H, Briggs ADM, Brooks PM, Brown J, Brugha TS,  
 910 Buchbinder R, Buckle GC, Bukhman G, Bulloch AG, Burch M, Burnett R, Cardenas R, Cabral NL,  
 911 Campos-Nonato IR, Campuzano JC, Carapetis JR, Carpenter DO, Caso V, Castaneda-Orjuela CA,  
 912 Catala-Lopez F, Chadha VK, Chang JC, Chen H, Chen W, Chiang PP, Chimed-Ochir O, Chowdhury R,  
 913 Christensen H, Christophi CA, Chugh SS, Cirillo M, Coggeshall M, Cohen A, Colistro V, Colquhoun  
 914 SM, Contreras AG, Cooper LT, Cooper C, Cooperrider K, Coresh J, Cortinovis M, Criqui MH, Crump  
 915 JA, Cuevas-Nasu L, Dandona R, Dandona L, Dansereau E, Dantes HG, Dargan PI, Davey G, Davitoiu  
 916 D V., Dayama A, De La Cruz-Gongora V, De La Vega SF, De Leo D, Del Pozo-Cruz B, Dellavalle RP,  
 917 Deribe K, Derrett S, Des Jarlais DC, Dessalegn M, DeVeber GA, Dharmaratne SD, Diaz-Torne C,  
 918 Ding EL, Dokova K, Dorsey ER, Driscoll TR, Duber H, Durrani AM, Edmond KM, Ellenbogen RG,  
 919 Endres M, Ermakov SP, Eshrati B, Esteghamati A, Estep K, Fahimi S, Farzadfar F, Fay DFJ, Felson  
 920 DT, Fereshtehnejad SM, Fernandes JG, Ferri CP, Flaxman A, Foigt N, Foreman KJ, Fowkes FGR,  
 921 Franklin RC, Furst T, Futran ND, Gabbe BJ, Gankpe FG, Garcia-Guerra FA, Geleijnse JM, Gessner  
 922 BD, Gibney KB, Gillum RF, Ginawi IA, Giroud M, Giussani G, Goenka S, Goginashvili K, Gona P, De  
 923 Cosio TG, Gosselin RA, Gotay CC, Goto A, Gouda HN, Guerrant RL, Gughani HC, Gunnell D, Gupta  
 924 R, Gupta R, Gutierrez RA, Hafezi-Nejad N, Hagan H, Halasa Y, Hamadeh RR, Hamavid H, Hammami  
 925 M, Hankey GJ, Hao Y, Harb HL, Haro JM, Havmoeller R, Hay RJ, Hay S, Hedayati MT, Pi IBH,  
 926 Heydarpour P, Hajar M, Hoek HW, Hoffman HJ, Hornberger JC, Hosgood HD, Hossain M, Hotez PJ,

927 Hoy DG, Hsairi M, Hu H, Hu G, Huang JJ, Huang C, Huiart L, Hussein A, Iannarone M, Iburg KM,  
928 Innos K, Inoue M, Jacobsen KH, Jassal SK, Jeemon P, Jensen PN, Jha V, Jiang G, Jiang Y, Jonas JB,  
929 Joseph J, Juel K, Kan H, Karch A, Karimkhani C, Karthikeyan G, Katz R, Kaul A, Kawakami N, Kazi DS,  
930 Kemp AH, Kengne AP, Khader YS, Khalifa SEAH, Khan EA, Khan G, Khang YH, Khonelidze I, Kieling  
931 C, Kim D, Kim S, Kimokoti RW, Kinfu Y, Kinge JM, Kissela BM, Kivipelto M, Knibbs L, Knudsen AK,  
932 Kokubo Y, Kosen S, Kramer A, Kravchenko M, Krishnamurthi R V., Krishnaswami S, Defo BK, Bicer  
933 BK, Kuipers EJ, Kulkarni VS, Kumar K, Kumar GA, Kwan GF, Lai T, Laloo R, Lam H, Lan Q, Lansingh  
934 VC, Larson H, Larsson A, Lawrynowicz AEB, Leasher JL, Lee JT, Leigh J, Leung R, Levi M, Li B, Li Y, Li  
935 Y, Liang J, Lim S, Lin HH, Lind M, Lindsay MP, Lipshultz SE, Liu S, Lloyd BK, Ohno SL, Logroscino G,  
936 Looker KJ, Lopez AD, Lopez-Olmedo N, Lortet-Tieulent J, Lotufo PA, Low N, Lucas RM, Lunevicius  
937 R, Lyons RA, Ma J, Ma S, MacKay MT, Majdan M, Malekzadeh R, Mapoma CC, Marcenes W, March  
938 LM, Margono C, Marks GB, Marzan MB, Masci JR, Mason-Jones AJ, Matzopoulos RG, Mayosi BM,  
939 Mazorodze TT, McGill NW, McGrath JJ, McKee M, McLain A, McMahon BJ, Meaney PA,  
940 Mehndiratta MM, Mejia-Rodriguez F, Mekonnen W, Melaku YA, Meltzer M, Memish ZA, Mensah  
941 G, Meretoja A, Mhimbira FA, Micha R, Miller TR, Mills EJ, Mitchell PB, Mock CN, Moffitt TE,  
942 Ibrahim NM, Mohammad KA, Mokdad AH, Mola GL, Monasta L, Montico M, Montine TJ, Moore  
943 AR, Moran AE, Morawska L, Mori R, Moschandreas J, Moturi WN, Moyer M, Mozaffarian D,  
944 Mueller UO, Mukaigawara M, Murdoch ME, Murray J, Murthy KS, Naghavi P, Nahas Z, Naheed A,  
945 Naidoo KS, Naldi L, Nand D, Nangia V, Narayan K MV, Nash D, Nejjari C, Neupane SP, Newman LM,  
946 Newton CR, Ng M, Ngalesoni FN, Nhung NT, Nisar MI, Nolte S, Norheim OF, Norman RE, Norrving  
947 B, Nyakarahuka L, Oh IH, Ohkubo T, Omer SB, Opio JN, Ortiz A, Pandian JD, Pabello CIA,  
948 Papachristou C, Park EK, Parry CD, Caicedo AJP, Patten SB, Paul VK, Pavlin BI, Pearce N, Pedraza  
949 LS, Pellegrini CA, Pereira DM, Perez-Ruiz FP, Perico N, Pervaiz A, Pesudovs K, Peterson CB, Petzold  
950 M, Phillips MR, Phillips D, Phillips B, Piel FB, Plass D, Poenaru D, Polanczyk G V., Polinder S, Pope

951 CA, Popova S, Poulton RG, Pourmalek F, Prabhakaran D, Prasad NM, Qato D, Quistberg DA, Rafay  
 952 A, Rahimi K, Rahimi-Movaghar V, Rahman SU, Raju M, Rakovac I, Rana SM, Razavi H, Refaat A,  
 953 Rehm J, Remuzzi G, Resnikoff S, Ribeiro AL, Riccio PM, Richardson L, Richardus JH, Riederer AM,  
 954 Robinson M, Roca A, Rodriguez A, Rojas-Rueda D, Ronfani L, Rothenbacher D, Roy N, Ruhago GM,  
 955 Sabin N, Sacco RL, Ksoreide K, Saha S, Sahathevan R, Sahraian MA, Sampson U, Sanabria JR,  
 956 Sanchez-Riera L, Santos IS, Satpathy M, Saunders JE, Sawhney M, Saylan MI, Scarborough P,  
 957 Schoettker B, Schneider IJC, Schwebel DC, Scott JG, Seedat S, Sepanlou SG, Serdar B, Servan-Mori  
 958 EE, Shackelford K, Shaheen A, Shahraz S, Levy TS, Shangguan S, She J, Sheikhabaei S, Shepard DS,  
 959 Shi P, Shibuya K, Shinohara Y, Shiri R, Shishani K, Shiue I, Shrimel MG, Sigfusdottir ID, Silberberg  
 960 DH, Simard EP, Sindi S, Singh JA, Singh L, Skirbekk V, Sliwa K, Soljak M, Soneji S, Soshnikov SS,  
 961 Speyer P, Sposato LA, Sreeramareddy CT, Stoeckl H, Stathopoulou VK, Steckling N, Stein MB, Stein  
 962 DJ, Steiner TJ, Stewart A, Stork E, Stovner LJ, Stroumpoulis K, Sturua L, Sunguya BF, Swaroop M,  
 963 Sykes BL, Tabb KM, Takahashi K, Tan F, Tandon N, Tanne D, Tanner M, Tavakkoli M, Taylor HR, Te  
 964 Ao BJ, Temesgen AM, Have M Ten, Tenkorang EY, Terkawi AS, Theadom AM, Thomas E, Thorne-  
 965 Lyman AL, Thrift AG, Tleyjeh IM, Tonelli M, Topouzis F, Towbin JA, Toyoshima H, Traebert J, Tran  
 966 BX, Trasande L, Trillini M, Truelsen T, Trujillo U, Tsilimbaris M, Tuzcu EM, Ukwaja KN, Undurraga  
 967 EA, Uzun SB, Van Brakel WH, Van De Vijver S, Dingenen R Van, Van Gool CH, Varakin YY, Vasankari  
 968 TJ, Vavilala MS, Veerman LJ, Velasquez-Melendez G, Venketasubramanian N, Vijayakumar L,  
 969 Villalpando S, Violante FS, Vlassov V V., Waller S, Wallin MT, Wan X, Wang L, Wang J, Wang Y,  
 970 Warouw TS, Weichenthal S, Weiderpass E, Weintraub RG, Werdecker A, Wessells KR, Westerman  
 971 R, Wilkinson JD, Williams HC, Williams TN, Woldeyohannes SM, Wolfe CDA, Wong JQ, Wong H,  
 972 Woolf AD, Wright JL, Wurtz B, Xu G, Yang G, Yano Y, Yenesew MA, Yentur GK, Yip P, Yonemoto N,  
 973 Yoon SJ, Younis M, Yu C, Kim KY, Zaki MES, Zhang Y, Zhao Z, Zhao Y, Zhu J, Zonies D, Zunt JR,  
 974 Salomon JA, Murray CJL. 2015. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years

lived with disability for 301 acute and chronic diseases and injuries in 188 countries, 1990-2013: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 386:743–800.

60. HARB A, O’DEA M, HANAN ZK, ABRAHAM S, HABIB I. 2017. Prevalence, risk factors and antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* diarrhoeal infection among children in Thi-Qar Governorate, Iraq. *Epidemiol Infect* 1–11.

61. Loman NJ, Constantinidou C, Christner M, Rohde H, Chan JZ-M, Quick J, Weir JC, Quince C, Smith GP, Betley JR, Aepfelbacher M, Pallen MJ. 2013. A Culture-Independent Sequence-Based Metagenomics Approach to the Investigation of an Outbreak of Shiga-Toxigenic *Escherichia coli* O104:H4. *JAMA* 309:1502.

62. Aarestrup FM, Seyfarth AM, Emborg HD, Pedersen K, Hendriksen RS, Bager F. 2001. Effect of abolishment of the use of antimicrobial agents for growth promotion on occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in fecal enterococci from food animals in Denmark. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 45:2054–9.

63. Jensen V, de Knecht LV, Andersen, VD WA. 2014. Temporal relationship between decrease in antimicrobial prescription for Danish pigs and the “Yellow Card” legal intervention directed at reduction of antimicrobial use. *Prev Vet Med* 117:554–564.

64. Agersø Y, Aarestrup FM. 2013. Voluntary ban on cephalosporin use in Danish pig production has effectively reduced extended-spectrum cephalosporinase-producing *Escherichia coli* in slaughter pigs. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 68:569–572.

65. OIE. 2002. Qualitative and quantitative risk assessment for human salmonellosis due to multi-resistant *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT104 from consumption of Danish dry-cured pork sausages. *Prev Vet Med* 52:251–265.

997 66. Claycamp HG, Hooberman BH. 2004. Antimicrobial Resistance Risk Assessment in Food Safety. J  
998 Food Prot 67:2063–2071.

999 67. Snary EL, Kelly LA, Davison HC, Teale CJ, Wooldridge M. 2004. Antimicrobial resistance: a  
1000 microbial risk assessment perspective. J Antimicrob Chemother 53:906–17.

1001 68. Salisbury JG, Nicholls TJ, Lammerding AM, Turnidge J, Nunn MJ. A risk analysis framework for the  
1002 long-term management of antibiotic resistance in food-producing animals.

1003 69. Manaia CM. 2017. Assessing the Risk of Antibiotic Resistance Transmission from the Environment  
1004 to Humans: Non-Direct Proportionality between Abundance and Risk. Trends Microbiol 25:173–  
1005 181.

1006 70. Bezoen A, Van Haren W, Hanekamp JC. Emergence of a Debate: AGPs and Public Health.

1007 71. WHO. 2016. Critically Important Antimicrobials for Human Medicine, 5th Revision.

1008 72. Collineau L, Carmo LP, Endimiani A, Magouras I, Müntener C, Schüpbach-Regula G, Stärk KDC.  
1009 2017. Risk Ranking of Antimicrobial-Resistant Hazards Found in Meat in Switzerland. Risk Anal.

1010 73. Bartholomew MJ, Vose DJ, Tollefson LR, Travis CC. 2005. A Linear Model for Managing the Risk of  
1011 Antimicrobial Resistance Originating in Food Animals. Risk Anal 25:99–108.

1012 74. CVMP. 2013. Guideline on the assessment of the risk to public health from antimicrobial  
1013 resistance due to the use of an antimicrobial VMPs in food-producing animals.

1014 75. Martínez JL, Coque TM, Baquero F. 2014. What is a resistance gene? Ranking risk in resistomes.  
1015 Nat Rev Microbiol 13:116–123.

1016 76. Buchanan RL, Smith JL, Long W. 2000. Microbial risk assessment: dose-response relations and risk  
1017 characterization. Int J Food Microbiol 58:159–72.



- 1018 77. Lammerding AM, Fazil A. 2000. Hazard identification and exposure assessment for microbial food  
1019 safety risk assessment, p. 147–157. *In* International Journal of Food Microbiology. Elsevier.
- 1020 78. Nauta MJ. 2008. The Modular Process Risk Model (MPRM): a Structured Approach to Food Chain  
1021 Exposure Assessment, p. 99–136. *In* Microbial Risk Analysis of Foods. American Society of  
1022 Microbiology.
- 1023 79. Waltner-Toews D, McEwen SA. 1994. Residues of antibacterial and antiparasitic drugs in foods of  
1024 animal origin: a risk assessment. *Prev Vet Med* 20:219–234.
- 1025 80. Anonymous. 2014. MRSA risk assessment Prepared by the MRSA expert group.
- 1026 81. Alban L, Ellis-Iversen J, Andreasen M, Dahl J, Sönksen UW. 2017. Assessment of the Risk to Public  
1027 Health due to Use of Antimicrobials in Pigs—An Example of Pleuromutilins in Denmark. *Front Vet*  
1028 *Sci* 4:74.
- 1029 82. Alban L, Nielsen EO, Dahl J. 2008. A human health risk assessment for macrolide-resistant  
1030 *Campylobacter* associated with the use of macrolides in Danish pig production. *Prev Vet Med*  
1031 83:115–129.
- 1032 83. FDA. 2000. Human Health Impact of Fluoroquinolone Resistant *Campylobacter* Attributed to the  
1033 Consumption of Chicken Food and Drug Administration Center for Veterinary Medicine.
- 1034 84. Nelson JM, Chiller TM, Powers JH, Angulo FJ. 2007. Fluoroquinolone-Resistant *Campylobacter*  
1035 Species and the Withdrawal of Fluoroquinolones from Use in Poultry: A Public Health Success  
1036 Story. *Clin Infect Dis* 44:977–980.
- 1037 85. Anderson SA, Woo RWY, Crawford LM. 2001. Risk assessment of the impact on human health of  
1038 resistant *Campylobacter jejuni* from fluoroquinolone use in beef cattle. *Food Cont* 13–25.
- 1039 86. FDA. 2003. Guidance for Industry #152 - Evaluating the Safety of Antimicrobial New Animal Drugs

1040 with Regard to Their Microbiological Effects on Bacteria of Human Health Concern - October 23,  
1041 2003.

1042 87. Hurd HS, Doores S, Hayes D, Mathew A, Maurer J, Silley P, Singer RS, Jones RN. 2004. Public  
1043 Health Consequences of Macrolide Use in Food Animals: A Deterministic Risk Assessment. *J Food*  
1044 *Prot* 67:980–992.

1045 88. Hurd HS, Vaughn MB, Holtkamp D, Dickson J, Warnick L. Quantitative Risk from Fluoroquinolone-  
1046 Resistant Salmonella and Campylobacter Due to Treatment of Dairy Heifers with Enrofloxacin for  
1047 Bovine Respiratory Disease.

1048 89. Andreu Rico, Rianne Jacobs, Paul J. Van den Brink A. 2017. A probabilistic approach to assess  
1049 antibiotic resistance development risks in environmental compartments and its application to an  
1050 intensive aquaculture production scenario. *Environ Pollut* 231:918–928.

1051 90. Chaillou S, Chaulot-Talmon A, Caekebeke H, Cardinal M, Christieans S, Denis C, Hélène Desmonts  
1052 M, Dousset X, Feurer C, Hamon E, Joffraud J-J, La Carbona S, Leroi F, Leroy S, Lorre S, Macé S, Pilet  
1053 M-F, Prévost H, Rivollier M, Roux D, Talon R, Zagorec M, Champomier-Vergès M-C. 2015. Origin  
1054 and ecological selection of core and food-specific bacterial communities associated with meat  
1055 and seafood spoilage. *ISME J* 9:1105–1118.

1056 91. De Filippis F, La Stora A, Villani F, Ercolini D. 2013. Exploring the Sources of Bacterial Spoilers in  
1057 Beefsteaks by Culture-Independent High-Throughput Sequencing. *PLoS One* 8:e70222.

1058 92. S. Brula, J. Bassettb, P. Cookc, S. Katharioud PMRJB. 2012. “Omics” technologies in quantitative  
1059 microbial risk assessment. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 27:12–24.

1060 93. Scott A. McEwen RSS. 2006. Stakeholder position paper: The need for antimicrobial use data for  
1061 risk assessment. *Prev Vet Med* 73:169–176.

- 1062 94. Madsen AM, Hodge SE, Ottman R. 2011. Causal models for investigating complex disease: I. A  
1063 primer. *Hum Hered* 72:54–62.
- 1064 95. den Besten HMW, Amézquita A, Bover-Cid S, Dagnas S, Ellouze M, Guillou S, Nychas G, O’Mahony  
1065 C, Pérez-Rodriguez F, Membré J-M. 2017. Next generation of microbiological risk assessment:  
1066 Potential of omics data for exposure assessment. *Int J Food Microbiol*.
- 1067 96. Nadon C, Van Walle I, Gerner-Smidt P, Campos J, Chinen I, Concepcion-Acevedo J, Gilpin B, Smith  
1068 AM, Kam KM, Perez E, Trees E, Kubota K, Takkinen J, Nielsen EM, Carleton H, FWD-NEXT Expert  
1069 Panel. 2017. PulseNet International: Vision for the implementation of whole genome sequencing  
1070 (WGS) for global food-borne disease surveillance. *Eurosurveillance* 22:30544.

1071